

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Rao Rajashekhar

Serial No.: 10/574,117

Filed: August 10, 2007

Docket No.: I438,113,101/IF02P041WOUS

Title: DEVICE FOR UTILIZATION WITH THE SYNCHRONIZATION OF CLOCK SIGNALS, AND CLOCK SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZING METHOD

REMARKS

The following remarks are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed March 6, 2008. Claims 9-29 were rejected. With this Response, claims 9, 16, 21, 22, 24, 28 and 29 have been amended. Claims 13, 19, 20, 23 and 27 have been cancelled. Claims 9-12, 14-18, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28-29 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 20, 21 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

With this response, claims 20 and 27 have been cancelled. Claim 21, has been amended. Accordingly, Applicant believes the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 9-11, 15, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a/b) as being anticipated by “Applicant’s Prior Art.” Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9-11, 15, 28 and 29 are not anticipated by “Applicant’s Prior Art.”

With this response, independent claim 9 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 13. Similar amendments have been made to independent claims 28 and 29.

Applicant submits that “Applicant’s Prior Art” as noted in the Office Action fails to teach or suggest a **frequency detection device, wherein a duration of the time window is determined as a function of the frequency of the clock signal detected by the frequency detection device.**

In view of the above, Applicant requests that the above rejection of independent claims 9, 28 and 29 and the claims depending therefrom under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 9-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,445,231 to Baker et al.

Applicant submits that Baker also fails to teach or suggest the limitations recited by the amended independent claims 9, 16, 22, 28 and 29. Baker fails to disclose a **frequency detection**

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Rao Rajashekhar

Serial No.: 10/574,117

Filed: August 10, 2007

Docket No.: I438.113.101/IF02P041WOUS

Title: DEVICE FOR UTILIZATION WITH THE SYNCHRONIZATION OF CLOCK SIGNALS, AND CLOCK SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZING METHOD

device, wherein a duration of the time window is determined as a function of the frequency of the clock signal detected by the frequency detection device. Baker merely discloses a second delay device (216), identical to output circuit 112, which performs “a timing adjustment, such as a skew elimination or clock synchronization between two clock signals.” (See col. 4, lines 3-4 and col. 3, lines 33-35). Such a device is not claimed by Applicant in independent claims 9, 16, 22, 28 and 29.

In view of the above, claims 9, 16, 22, 28 and 29 are believed to be in form for allowance. Applicant requests that the above rejection of independent claims 9, 16, 22, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn. Dependent claims 10-12, 14-15, 17-18, and 22-26 further define patentably distinct independent claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant believes that these dependent claims are also allowable over the cited reference. Applicant notes that claims 13, 19, 20, 23 and 27 have been cancelled. Allowance of claims 9-12, 14-18, 21, 22, 24-26, 28 and 29 is respectfully requested.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 9-12, 14-18, 21, 22, 24-26, 28 and 29, and requests allowance of these claims.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Rao Rajashekhar

Serial No.: 10/574,117

Filed: August 10, 2007

Docket No.: I438.113.101/IF02P041WOUS

Title: DEVICE FOR UTILIZATION WITH THE SYNCHRONIZATION OF CLOCK SIGNALS, AND CLOCK SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZING METHOD

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 9-12, 14-18, 21, 22, 24-26, 28 and 29 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 9-12, 14-18, 21, 22, 24-26, 28 and 29 are respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(h)(i). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0471.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Steven E. Dicke at Telephone No. (612) 573-2002, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Dicke, Billig & Czaja
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Respectfully submitted,

Rao Rajashekhar et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2000
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: June 6, 2008

SED/GAK:cjs

/Steven E. Dicke/

Steven E. Dicke

Reg. No. 38,431